

# THE COMMUNIST

Official Organ of the Communist Party of America.  
SECTION OF THE THIRD COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Vol. II, No. 17.

FEBRUARY 1st, 1921.

PRICE 5 CENTS

## The Burning Question of Unity

We must state right in the beginning that the Communist Party objected to unity with the leaders of the former C. L. P. as well as with the LEADERS of the present so-called United Communist Party, for we consider these leaders to be centrists who intend to combine two incompatible teachings—Communism and Syndicalism (sometimes called in this country "industrialism").

The program adopted at the Second Convention of the Communist Party of America in its attitude toward trade and industrial unions is fully in keeping with the position taken on this question by the Second World Congress of the Communist International.

The United Communist Party at its first convention adopted a semi-syndicalist, semi-opportunist program. The attitude of the U. C. P. toward the old reactionary trade unions was thoroughly discussed at the 2nd Congress of the C. I. The Congress condemned this attitude of the U. C. P. and declared that the policy of deliberately splitting the A. F. of L. would endanger the Communist movement in America by isolating it from the organized labor movement as a whole.

This policy of the U. C. P. was severely criticized by both Karl Radek and Zinoviev who ridiculed these tactics, quoting directly from the U. C. P. program, and refusing to make any compromise on this question.

There was another vital question upon which the Communist Party could not agree with the centrist leaders of the U. C. P.—the question of propagating to the masses the necessity of armed insurrection and civil war for the purpose of overthrowing the capitalist state. The centrist leaders of the U. C. P. do not and did not deny the necessity for armed insurrection, but like other centrist parties, it gives its own interpretation of the meaning and content of armed insurrection. According to the written statement of the U. C. P. theoreticians, the proletariat should only resort to force of arms in the case of self-defense or self-protection. This theory will not hold water and entirely contradicts the actual historical facts based upon the experience of at least two proletarian revolutions.

The use of armed force thus should be considered, not only as a means of defense—as proposed by the centrist leaders of the U. C. P.—but also as a method of offense at the right moment—during an economic or political crisis,—and in this tactic the working class in the United States must be constantly and consistently educated as a vital part of communist propaganda.

The leaders of the U. C. P. go further in their effort to enfeeble and to distort the meaning and to minimize the importance of this principle of communist tactics. The U. C. P. declare in their program, that; "...the working class must be prepared for armed insurrection as the final form of mass action by which the workers shall conquer the state power and establish the proletarian dictatorship."

Thus the leaders of the U. C. P. in both cases postpone the use of armed force indefinitely. Their policy, in this respect, reminds us of the action of the Mensheviks, the opportunists and centrists of all other countries, who use all their efforts to thwart the approach of the social revolution.

Let us now analyze the attitude of the centrist leaders of the U. C. P. toward the question of mass action.

The following paragraph of the U. C. P.

program reveals their position on this question. "It is through revolutionary mass action of the working class that the power of the capitalist state will be destroyed and the proletarian government established."

The program of the U. C. P. in its definition of mass action distorts the real meaning of this tactic; it is not in keeping with the actual facts. Mass action of the working class is a spontaneous act, usually provoked by the dissatisfaction of the proletarian masses with their economic conditions, or as a result of an economic crisis usually culminating in a sharpening of the class antagonism and class war. Spontaneous mass action of the working masses—even of a revolutionary character—as such is of no value, if it is not backed, directed and controlled by the most class-conscious part of the proletariat, i.e. if it is not directed and controlled by the proletarian vanguard, the Communist Party. The Soviets in Russia, after the March revolution, were revolutionary in their character. BUT WHILE THEY WERE LED BY THE MENSHEVIKI AND THE SOCIAL REVOLUTIONISTS, i.e. BY THE YELLOW SOCIAL PATRIOTS AND CENTRISTS, THEY HAD NO INFLUENCE AND WERE DEVOID OF POWER. They attained this power and influence only when the leadership of the Soviets came into the hands of the Bolsheviks or Communists. The mighty power of the Soviets in Russia is due to the influence of the proletarian vanguard in their midst.

The destruction of the capitalist state and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship in the form of Soviet government will be carried out by means of revolutionary mass action of the working class under the leadership and control of the proletarian vanguard, i.e. of a disciplined, mighty, Communist Party. Such a Communist Party can never be built up by the leaders of the U. C. P. with their non-communist misconceptions and their centrist tendencies.

These are briefly the essential points which have separated the Communist Party and the U. C. P. up to the Second Congress of the Communist International. It is obvious that these differences are of vital importance. These two parties disagreed in their attitude toward trade and industrial unions.

At the conventions in Chicago both the U. C. P. and the C. L. P. suffered from the "infantile sickness of 'left' communism" as Lenin aptly called it. Both parties insisted that the A. F. of L. and similar unions must be split up and that in their place should be organized brand-new "revolutionary" unions built on an industrial basis. But the Communist Party of America at its first convention in Chicago, definitely and clearly explained the role and the importance of the vanguard of the proletariat,—of a political party as distinct from the working class as a whole—it clearly presented the role of the Communist Party as the leading and directing force in the proletarian mass action. The Program, adopted by the Communist Party at its first convention, pointed out with absolute clearness, that the political party must be the guide of the working masses, that the Communist Party must not isolate itself from the masses if it does not wish to be more than a pitiful political sect.

In contradiction to this otherwise clear conception of its function as a political party of the working class, the Communist Party was inconsistent in its attitude toward

the trade and industrial unions at its September 1st Convention.

The COMMUNIST LABOR PARTY, was launched under the direct influence of the syndicalist elements at its first convention in Chicago, and had no clear understanding of the vital importance of a proletarian political party nor of its role in the proletarian revolution. All the leaders of the C. L. P. laid more stress upon the purely economic movement of the working class. They upheld the I. W. W. as against the A. F. of L. According to the leaders of the Communist Labor Party a political party was of less importance than the economic organizations of the working class in their struggle against the capitalist class and the capitalist state.

In spite of the fact that the C. L. P. formally and in words recognized the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it had no clear conception of the importance of the role of the political party of the working class before and during the revolutionary period—before the conquest of political power by the proletariat, and at the time of and after the seizure of state power by the workers.

At the first convention of the Communist Party some few syndicalist elements joined it through misunderstanding; they exercised a slight influence in the shaping of our first program thus making our attitude toward the trade unions vague and indefinite. These syndicalist elements of the Damon and Caxton type showed themselves in their true colors at the time when differences first arose in the C. E. C. of our party last year. The most essential differences between the "minority" and majority of the C. E. C. of the C. P. of A. consisted in the misconception of the so-called minority of the distinction between the masses and the party. According to the opinions of the "minority" PARTY and CLASS are identical.

Damon and Caxton and kindred elements in the Communist Party were imbued with opportunist and syndicalist ideas which obscured in their minds the importance of the role of the political party before, during, and after the conquest of state power by the proletariat. On the other hand, Damon, Caxton and Co. had menshevik and opportunist tendencies which appeared in their attitude toward mass action and the question of armed insurrection.

After DAMON, CAXTON, & CO. left our party and united with their Siamese twin brothers, the COMMUNIST LABOR PARTY, thereby artificially creating the "UNITED" COMMUNIST PARTY. The program of this "UNITED" party, which is composed of elements that never should have been separated, has been sufficiently criticized in this article. The syndicalist ideology prevails throughout it, while at the same time it is accompanied by opportunism of the worst kind.

Damon, Caxton and Co. in spite of all their machinations did not succeed in their attempt to destroy the Communist Party, since only an insignificant number of our members followed in their footsteps. Disappointed in their attempt to destroy the only consistent and true proletarian party—the Communist Party of America—and aware that the "UNITED" Communist Party had miserably failed to unite the communist elements in this country upon their non-communist program, Damon, Caxton, Holt, & Co. began to scheme and to adopt other measures to break the C. P. of A.



The C. E. C. of the United Communist Party sent its emissaries to Moscow in order to discredit our party in the eyes of the Executive Committee of the C. I. On questions of principle the leaders of the U. C. P. could not attack us for we stood on solid ground on all questions of fundamental communist tactics and principles. Already, before the Second World Congress of the Communist International had convened, our party, delivered from its few centrist elements, took the correct stand in its attitude toward the trade and industrial unions, entirely giving up its old prejudices toward the A. F. of L. As we pointed out above, our former attitude toward participation in the reactionary unions, contradicted our attitude toward mass action. The Communist Party of America, at its Second Convention, erased from its program, the syndicalistic points as contradictory to the tenets of Marx and the experiences of the proletarian revolutionary movement.

To our great sorrow and regret, our delegates, Fraina and Stocklitsky, did not and could not represent our position in the Second Congress of the C. I. as they defended in our name a policy which the Communist Party of America had repudiated at its second convention, and upon which the Communist International declared war—the policy of splitting the A. F. of L. and kindred organizations. In this respect our delegates met with the well merited rebuke of Comrade Radek, who accused them of hypocrisy. That our party was to some extent discredited at the Second World Congress of the C. I. is not altogether our fault; our delegates were out of touch with the latest developments in our party and were elected by the September first convention: our program which was adopted at our second convention, before the position taken by Fraina and Stocklitsky on the question of participation in the reactionary trade unions, was not the position of the U. C. P. of A. which was misrepresented by our delegates. The Communist International, judging us by our delegates, who misrepresented us, saw no difference between the views of our delegates and the delegates of the U. C. P. and doubtless influenced the Communist International's decision to force immediate unity.

The outrageous and shameless lies, spread by the U. C. P. delegates in Moscow that the membership of our party was only about 1500, composed entirely of foreign language "groups", while the membership of the U. C. P. was over 10,000 and included all the "real" American communists influenced by Executive Com. or the Com. Int. and caused them to make their hasty decision, demanding the immediate and unconditional unity with the U. C. P.—for the Executive Committee of the Com. Intern. believing the lies of the U. C. P. delegates, considered us a small and unimportant sect, who had no good reason for separate existence, and was standing in the way of the unity of all communist forces in America.

With the arrival of our accredited delegate, Comrade Andrew, the whole situation rapidly changed. The Executive Committee of the Com. Intern. has recognized the fact that the Communist Party of America is not a small, intransigent, sect, but that on the contrary, is a strong virile, organization, maintaining itself without assistance from the C. I., carrying on a consistent and powerful communist propaganda in seven languages besides English—the only consistent communist Party in America.

Before the arrival of Comrade Andrew the Communist Party was not represented on the Ex. Com. of the C. I. After his arrival they considered it necessary to appoint Comrade Andrew as our representative on the E. C. of the C. I. Thus our position became strong, due to the fact that we took the correct position on all questions of communist principles and tactics and because we were able to refute the miserable lies and expose the cheap clap-trap of the U. C. P. delegates.

Upon receiving the information that the Communist International sent us a mandate for the unity of both parties, we immediately complied with this decision and were ready to unite with the U. C. P. even before we had received an official communication from Moscow to this effect. Our members are well posted on all the details of the negotia-

tions on unity between the two parties, and there is therefore no necessity to repeat all the arguments and documents. The C. E. C. has at all times during these negotiations kept our membership fully informed of every move and shall continue to do so.

Now we must untie the Gordian knot—to solve the following questions:—Why is unity not yet achieved according to the mandate of the Communist International and within the time limit (Jan. 1, 1921)?

The Communist Party of America does not thwart unity; it has no reason whatsoever to prevent unity. We have already pointed out that on all questions of Communist principles and tactics our party has taken a correct stand, fully in keeping with the decisions of the Com. Intern. Besides this, our party counts a much greater membership than the U. C. P. But even if our membership was actually smaller than the U. C. P. we would have no fear of uniting with the rank and file of the U. C. P. including their centrist leaders, for under the protection of the Communist International we would always have the right of appeal against any non-communist activities of the majority and on matters of principle and tactics. According to the Statutes of the Communist International its Executive Committee is empowered to demand of all parties affiliated with them, the expulsion of groups or individuals from its ranks. It must be obvious that under this provision there is no danger whatever to the communist movement in America in uniting with the centrist leaders of the U. C. P.

On account of the internal dissensions which would inevitable arise as a result of conflicting points of view between the centrist leaders of the U. C. P. and our party makes co-operation with these centrist leaders undesirable and would obstruct and hamper the constructive work of the party. As a minority within a real unified communist party the centrist leaders of the U. C. P. would have no standing, and they know it, that is why they so desperately oppose the conditions made mandatory upon both parties by the Communist International. They would be repudiated by the entire membership of a united party, including their own deluded followers. On the question of principles and tactics the position of the U. C. P. leaders is in contradiction to that adopted by the Second Congress of the C. I. At this

Congress war was declared on the policy of attempting to split the old unions; the syndicalist policy of the U. C. P. was condemned and rejected. But perhaps the leaders of the U. C. P. have admitted their error and changed their anarcho-syndicalist-opportunist policies, after the Congress of the C. I.? In vain we look for some manifestation of this change in the official organs of the U. C. P. We have burned the midnight oil, looking with a spy glass through the journals of the U. C. P. to find some

evidence of a change in the opportunist-syndicalist point of view of the U. C. P. but the crowing of the cock reminded us that the search was in vain. On the contrary, the more we read the literature of the U. C. P. after the Congress of the C. I., the more convincing it becomes that the U. C. P. leaders have not changed; that they are still the same old anarcho-opportunists and centr-

ists as before.

The leaders of the U. C. P. had a good opportunity to show their real communist understanding when the question of the affiliation of the I. W. W. with the Communist International was before the membership of the I. W. W. in their recent referendum. The leaders of the U. C. P. openly, in their official organ, The Communist, came out against such affiliation, arguing that in case the I. W. W. decided to join the C. I. it would force the I. W. W. underground, and according to the opinion of the U. C. P. it is not advisable for an economic organization to become an illegal organization. In this case the leaders of the U. C. P. defied the decisions of the C. I. and against the will of the communists in the rank and file of the I. W. W. playing into the hands of the reactionary syndicalist leaders of the I. W. W. and thereby supporting the counter-revolutionary editor Sandgren, since repudiated by his own membership.

The centrist leaders of the U. C. P. criticized a leaflet issued by the Communist

Party on the occasion of the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Car strike, in which it was pointed out that the workers could not emancipate themselves from wage slavery unless they overthrow the capitalist state and established the dictatorship of the proletariat and that in order to attain this aim the working class of America must prepare themselves for armed insurrection. In fact, all the facts go to prove that the leaders of the U. C. P. did not change their Anarcho-opportunist and centrist viewpoint.

From all this we cannot escape the conclusion that the chasm which separated the Communist Party of America from the United Communist Party still exists. Someone may ask why do the leaders of the U. C. P. remain in the C. I. if they do not agree with the principles and tactics of the Communist International? Why do they not leave it? The reply to this question is found in the theses and statutes of the Communist International. In these "The Fundamental Tasks of the Communist International" Comrade Lenin quotes:

1) "A characteristic feature of the present moment in the development of the international communist movement, is the fact that in all the capitalist countries the best representatives of the revolutionary proletariat have completely understood the fundamental principles of the Communist International, namely, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the power of the Soviets; and with a loyal enthusiasm have placed themselves on the side of the Com. Intern. A still more important and great step forward is the unlimited sympathy with these principles manifested by the wider masses not only of the proletariat of the towns but also by the advanced portions of the agrarian workers."

"On the other hand two mistakes or weakness of the extraordinarily, rapidly increasing international communist movement have shown themselves. One, very serious and presenting a great direct danger for the success of the cause of the liberation of the proletariat, consists in the fact that part of the old leaders and parties of the Second International, partly half unconsciously yielding to the wishes and the pressure of the masses, partly consciously deceiving them in order to preserve their former role of agents and supporters of the bourgeoisie inside the labor movement, are declaring their conditional and even unconditional affiliation to the Third International; while remaining in reality in the whole practice of their party and political work, on the level of the Second International. Such a state of things is absolutely inadmissible, because it demoralizes the masses, hinders the development of a strong communist party, and lowers their respect for the Third International by threatening repetition of such betrayals as that of the Hungarian Social-Democrats, who had rapidly assumed the disguise of Communists. The second much less important mistake, which is for the most part a malady inherent to the party growth of the movement, is the tendency to be extremely "left", which leads to an erroneous evaluation of the role and duties of the party in respect to the class and to the mass, and the obligation of the revolutionary communists to work in the bourgeois parliaments and the reactionary

ones."

In the Theses on "The Conditions for admission to the Communist International" Comrade Zinoviev writes:

"The Com. Intern. more and more frequently receives applications from parties and groups but a short time ago belonging to the Second Intern., but not yet really communists. The Second International is completely broken. Seeing the complete helplessness of the Second International, the intermediary groups and factions of the "centre" are trying to lean on the ever strengthening Communist International, hoping at the same time, however, to preserve a certain "autonomy" which would enable them to carry on their former opportunist or "centrist" policy. The Communist International has become the fashion."

"The desire of certain leading groups of the centre to join the Third International now, is an indirect confirmation of the majority of the conscious workers of the whole world, and that it is growing stronger every day."







way to Socialism leads through the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is characterized by the government of the revolutionary Soviets. The first task of the working class is the struggle to obtain the downfall of the political, economic and intellectual dominance of Imperialism, and to institute proletarian dictatorship. This struggle can only come to a victorious end when the Second International, which has been struck fast in the mire of reformism and compromises with the bourgeoisie, and is endeavoring to save bourgeois society, betraying thereby all the working class. Only then will the working masses under the standard of the Communist International, the leader of the proletariat in its revolutionary struggle. In a revolutionary epoch one must employ primarily the means of revolutionary struggle of the masses—demonstrations, strikes, general strikes, armed uprisings. But at the same time the proletariat cannot reject in principle other political resources, such as the Parliament. The entry into Parliament depends on the political situation of the moment, and must be decided in each case separately by the organization of each country.

2. If the position of mature workmen under the rule of capitalism is exceptionally hard, the position of the working youth is quite intolerable. Low wages, a long working day, barbarous treatment from the contractors and inhuman conditions, where the apprentices are wholly in the power of their trade masters. Such an unlimited exploitation of young workers hinders their intellectual and physical development. The bourgeois government allows the working youth only as much education as is necessary to be able to utilize it to the utmost degree, in the capacity of zealous and useful domestic cattle. The bourgeoisie strives to entice the youth into its own circle of ideas. Schools, clerical and bourgeois unions of young people, as well as militarization, have but one object—to alienate the proletarian Youth from the struggle for Socialism, and to train them into devoted soldiers of Imperialism. The world war considerably aggravated the situation: millions of youthful proletarians were sent to the front as cannon-fodder, and millions driven into munition works.

But although the State and the contractors exhaust the strength of the youth to the utmost, political and personal rights are only permitted them in the very slightest degree. Such a state of things has incited the working youth to a merciless struggle against Imperialism.

3. The formation of a separate organization of proletarian youth is dictated: a. By the position of the Youth in the process of production and in society; this position forces it to fight in defence of its own interests, in the organization of labor, reforming of schools, etc. b. By the psychological peculiarities of youth (the prevalence of sentiment over reason, aptitude for cooperation, great receptivity as regards all new and revolutionary ideas, readiness for sacrifice and action), c. By the necessity of special methods for its Socialist and revolutionary education (independent organizational work, active participation in political manifestations), the application of all methods which give youthful workers an opportunity

of acquiring qualities which will be extremely necessary to them in the future, as champions of the proletariat and bearers of the Revolution.

4. The working Youth is the most active and most revolutionary part of the proletariat. The most important task of the Communist organization of Youth is, for the present, an organization of Youth in the wide masses of unwearied agitation and carrying out of workers' demonstrations, the immediate struggle for Communism, taking part in the overthrow of capitalist tyranny, and the education of the Youth to make them fit for the building of the Communist community.

5. The Communist organization of the Youth carries on an energetic struggle against all the bourgeois parties, and also against such right Socialist lackeys of the bourgeoisie, as Scheidemann, Reuter, Bissolati, Renaudel, Heider, son, Gompers, Troelstra, Branting, Vandervelde, etc. and against the Socialist "centre" (Kautsky, MacDonald, Robert Grimm, Bauer and others), who by their hesitations only tend to uphold capitalist society. The struggle likewise against the Syndicalist struggle for the conquest of the political dictatorship, rejects the right of proletarian party to conduct this struggle, and rejects proletarian centralization. They equally struggle against the Anarchist ideology, which does not admit the proletarian government as an intermediate phase between capitalism and Communism, and which preaches in the sphere of political economy petty bourgeois ideas. The struggle is directed against those organizations of the Youth which are connected with the above-mentioned parties. In their political struggle the organizations of the Youth keep to the principles of that party or local faction which is affiliated with the Third International, or to the principles proclaimed in the program of the Communist International. The organizational relations towards the Party are determined by two fundamental principles: 1) The Independence of the Youth; 2) Close contact and reciprocal help.

6. Although the Communist organizations of the Youth continue an energetic struggle against bourgeois militarism in all its abstract and practical forms, yet they do not defend the ideas of Liberal pacifism. They know that the working class will yet be forced to defend its own victorious dictatorship from unexpected attacks by the bourgeoisie, to have recourse to arms and to fight against bourgeois militarism. For the arming of the proletariat! For the Red Army! That is the cry of the Communist Youth.

7. The struggle for the amelioration of the economic situation of proletarian Youth is one of the principal problems of the organizations of the Youth. A radical reform of the conditions of labor is only possible in a Communist community. At the present period of capitalist domination it is possible to attain a partial amelioration of the situation of the Youth only through the revolutionary class-struggle, but in no wise by collaborating with the compromisers and with the bourgeois governments.

8. One of the elementary problems of Communist organizations of the Youth is the training of well-developed proletarian champions and future builders of Communist society. Communist judgment and readiness for action are attained not only by taking part in the political struggle, but also through theoretical Socialist instruction, which proves a sharp weapon in

the fight against bourgeois ideology. Socialist education combined with active participation in the political struggle—these are the true methods of forming youthful proletarian champions.

9. Moreover the Communist organizations of the Youth set themselves the task of universal education of Youth in the Marxist spirit, thereby raising the culture level. The working Youth must extend from the bourgeoisie the treasures of human knowledge, which are inaccessible to the workers as a guide in the liberating movement of the proletariat. They must conquer the paths to science, literature and art. Besides honest workmen and brave soldiers of the Red Army, the working Youth must supply scholars, technical specialists, new Communist philosophers, poets and artists of the new Communist Society. It is the mission of the working Youth and its organizations to be in the first ranks of the constructors of the new culture, conceived by the Communist Spirit.

10. The Communist organizations must turn the proletarian Youth into a healthy people, healthy bodily and spiritually. Therefore the Communist organizations of the Youth are concerned also with the physical development of the young. This work, to which at present we can only give part of our activity, is of great importance for the working Youth.

11. Although the Communist organizations of the Youth strive to influence with their ideas wide circles of proletarian Youth, nevertheless this is not done by sacrificing anything of the clearness of the Communist programme is the agitation by the Communist organizations of the Youth among the village workmen and the poorest peasants.

12. The Communist International of the Youth looks upon the existence of separate organizations. Honest revolutionists from the ranks of the young students must become members of the proletarian organization of Youth, as equals amongst equals, as comrades amongst comrades. The formation of groups of educated Youth within the general organizations of Youth must be regulated according to the conditions in each separate country.

13. In the present revolutionary epoch, the struggle of the proletariat can only be victorious, if it is world-wide.

This refers also to the struggle of the proletarian Youth. Therefore the political organizations of the Youth unite themselves under the standard of the Communist International of the Youth. The great aim of the International of Youth is centralization in the guidance of all work and struggle of the Communist organizations of Youth in all the different countries. Its regulations dictate the supreme law to all the organizations of the Youth. Its practical work consists in international agitation and international guidance of political manifestations. Its duty is to give unity to all the activity of the organizations of the Youth, to serve them as a directing force, to support them morally and materially, to form new unions and to connect as closely together, as possible the proletarian organizations of the Youth of all countries.

14. The Communist International of the First Youth stands on the principles of the First Congress of the Communist International. The Central Committee of the Communist International of Youth is bound through its organization to the Third International, and works in close connection with it.

## Lenin's Thesis On Bourgeois Democracy and Proletarian Dictatorship.

The growth of the proletarian revolutionary movement in every country has on the part of the bourgeoisie and their agents in the workers' organizations called forth efforts to find plausible political arguments in defence of the domination of the exploiters. In these arguments the condemnation of dictatorship and defence of Democracy are favorite themes. The lying and hypocrisy of such arguments, which the capitalist Press and the Yellow International Conference at Bern, February, 1919, in a thousand ways repeated, is, however, clear to anyone who does not wish to be a traitor to Socialism.

2.—In the first place, these demonstrations deal with "democracy in general" and "dictatorship in general" without stating what class one is talking about. To state the position thus, outside and above the class question, as if it were the position of the nation in general, is a direct contradiction to the fundamental lesson of Socialism, namely, the lesson of the class war, taught in words, but forgotten in practice by Socialists who have gone over to the bourgeois camp. For in none of the civilized capitalist countries does a "general democracy" exist, but only a bourgeois democracy, and it is not a question of "dictatorship in general," but of the dictatorship of the oppressed class, i.e., the proletariat, over the oppressors and exploiters, i.e., the bourgeoisie, with the object of overcoming the resistance of the exploiter in his fight to maintain his domination.

3.—History teaches that never has an oppressed class attained power nor can attain to it without a period of dictatorship, i.e., the conquering of political power and the forcible suppression of the most desperate, furious and pitiless resistance which the exploiters have always, at the cost of any crime, maintained,

The bourgeoisie, whose mastery is now defended by Socialists, who speak against "dictatorship in general" and with body and soul advocate "democracy in general", has won its power by a series of revolts, civil wars, through violent suppression of monarchies, feudalism and slavery. Thousands and millions of times have Socialists in every country in their books, pamphlets, Congress resolutions and agitation speeches, pointed out to the people the class character of these bourgeois revolutions. Therefore the present defence of "bourgeois democracy" in speeches on "democracy in general", and the present outcry against the dictatorship of the proletariat, in talking about "dictatorship in general", is a direct betrayal of Socialism and definite going over to the camp of the bourgeoisie. It is a denial of the rights of the proletariat to a proletarian revolution; a defence of middle-class snobs' reformism just at the very historical moment when such reformism has gone bankrupt throughout the whole world and the war has created a revolutionary situation.

4.—All Socialists in explaining the class character of bourgeois civilization, democracy and parliamentarism, have spoken the thoughts which have been put forth with the greatest scientific exactitude by Marx and Engels, that the democratic bourgeois Republic is nothing but a machine for suppressing the working class by the bourgeoisie; the masses of the workers by a handful of capitalists. There is not one genuine revolutionary, and not one genuine Marxist among those who are now raising their cry against dictatorship, and standing for democracy, who has not solemnly sworn (hooh and heiling) before the workers that he recognized this fundamental truth of Socialism; and yet now when a fermentation and move-

ment has begun amongst the revolutionary proletariat with the intention of smashing this Machine of Oppression and fighting for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat these traitors to Socialism talk about the matter as though the resistance of the capitalists was finished, and as though they were willing to put themselves under the workers' majority. In a word as though in the Democratic Republic there never had been and never would be a State-Apparatus for crushing Labor with Capital.

5.—The Paris Commune, which all praise who wish to appear as Socialists, because they know that the great mass of the workers look with sympathy upon it, has especially shown in a clear manner the historical, conditional, and limited value of bourgeois Parliamentarism and Democracy, which in comparison to the state of society in the Middle Ages constituted a great step forward, but which to-day at the time of the workers' revolution must be radically altered. Already Marx, who placed the greatest value on the historical meaning of the Commune, had in his analysis thereof pointed out the exploiting character of the bourgeoisie and Democracy and Parliamentarism, in which the oppressed classes held it right to determine once in the course of many years what members of the possessing classes should go in or come out of Parliament. Yet now, when unrest is seething throughout the world, and before all eyes furthering the cause of Communism, the traitors of Socialism forget the practical experience and concrete lesson of the Paris Commune, and simply repeat the old rubbish about "Democracy in general". The Commune was a non-parliamentary concern.

6.—The significance of the Commune went further in that it attempted to overthrow and utterly destroy the bourgeois State-Apparatus,



the apparatus of Officialdom, Law, War and Police, and to put in its place the autonomous mass-organization of the workers, which recognized no division between legislative and executive power. All middle-class Democratic Republics in our times, including the German, which are held up as proletarian by the truth-falsifying traitors of Socialism, still maintain this bourgeois State-Apparatus, which continually demonstrates more clearly and plainly than ever that the outcry in defence of "Democracy in general" is nothing else but a defence of capitalism and the privileges of profiteers.

7.—"Freedom of Assembly" can be taken as an example of the demands of "Pure Democracy." Every enlightened worker who has not broken with his class understands that it was a ridiculous thing to promise the profiteers freedom of assembly for every period and situation where it prevented their overthrow and defended their privileges. The bourgeoisie when they were revolutionary, neither in England in the year 1849, nor in France in the year 1793, granted to the monarchist and nobility Freedom of Assembly while the latter poured foreign troops into the country and "assembled" in order to organize their efforts at restoration. If the bourgeoisie of to-day, which has long since become reactionary, demands from the proletariat this unrestricted right of Free Assembly, it will only be laughed at by the workers as an example of bourgeois hypocrisy.

Besides, the workers know very well that "Freedom of Assembly" even in the democratic bourgeois Republic is only an empty phrase, for the rich have the best public and private buildings at their disposal, and have also plenty of spare time for meetings and looking after their own ends in protecting the capitalist Power-Apparatus.

The town and village proletariat, as well as the small farmer, i.e., the great majority of the population, have none of these advantages. And so long as this is the case the word "Equality" that is to say, "Pure Democracy" is a fraud. To get real Equality, for Democracy to definitely realize it for the workers, the fine public and private buildings must be taken away from the exploiters, and it is also of the highest importance that the workers see to it that the freedom of their meetings is defended by armed workers, and not by young sons of nobles (Soehnen des Adels) or officers from the capitalist circles and their conscript soldiers.

Only after such an alteration can one without humbugging the worker, the working population, the poor, speak about "Freedom of Assembly" and Equality. But this alteration nobody else can bring about except the vanguard of the working people, the proletariat, which overthrows the exploiter, the bourgeoisie.

8.—The "Freedom of the Press" is another of the main watchword of "Pure Democracy." The worker knows, and it has been millions of times agreed by Socialists in every country, that this freedom is sheer fraud so long as the best printing presses and big stores of paper are in the hands of the capitalists, and so long as the power which capital has over the Press remains, which is so plain and clear all over the world, so cynically interwoven with democratic and republican regimes. As, for example, in America. To obtain a genuine equality and a genuine democracy for the working masses, one must first of all take away from the capitalist the possibility of employing writers in their service and the buying up of newspapers and publishing offices. And to do this it is necessary to throw off the yoke of capitalism, to overthrow the exploiter and their resistance. Capitalists have always explained the word "freedom" as freedom of profits for the rich and freedom of starvation for the poor. Capitalists explain "Freedom of the Press" as freedom of bribery by the rich, the freedom for employing wealth to fabricate and falsify so-called public opinion. The defender of "Pure Democracy" shows himself, in reality, as the defender of the dirty and mercenary system of the power of riches over the means of brushing aside the well-known historical task of freeing the Press from capital. The Communists will establish real freedom and equality, in which there is no possibility of enriching oneself at the expense of others, which will prevent the submission of the Press, directly or indirectly, to money-power, and where nothing will hinder the worker (or any particular group of workers) from equal rights to the use of the printing presses and paper that belong to the community.

9.—The history of the 19th and 20th century showed us before the war what in reality the much-talked-of "Pure Democracy" meant under capitalism. The Marxists have always asserted that the more developed, i.e., the "purer" democracy is, the more pitiless and keen will be the class-war be, and the more developed will be the oppression of capital and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The Dreyfus case in Republican France, the bloody settlement of accounts between the paid hiring armies of the capitalists and the workers on strike in the free and democratic Republic of America, and thousands of the same class of instances, show the fact, which the bourgeoisie try in vain to hide, that in democratic Republics terrorism and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie assume the reins of power openly immediately it appears to the exploiters that the power of capital is tottering.

10.—The Imperialist war, 1914-1918, has once for all shown the least progressive workers the true character of the capitalist democracy even in the freest Republic, which is nothing

less than bourgeois dictatorship. With the aim of enriching the German and English groups of millionaires and multimillionaires, dozens of millions of men have been murdered, and in the most free Republics the bourgeois military dictatorship is set up. This military dictatorship still continues in the Entente countries even after the overthrow of Germany. The war, more than anything else, has opened the eyes of the workers. The false mask has been torn from the bourgeois democracy, and the people can see the whole picture of speculation and profiteering during the war and opportunities opened up by the war. Capitalism has carried on this war in the name of freedom and equality. In the name of freedom and equality it has enriched the supplies of war materials to an unheard of extent. Yet not a bit does the Yellow International at Berné bother itself about this, but continues to whitewash before the old character of bourgeois freedom, bourgeois equality, and bourgeois democracy.

11.—In the most capitalist developed country of Europe, namely, in Germany, the first few months of full Republican freedom, which the overthrow of Imperialistic Germany brought about, have shown to the German workers and to the whole world what is the true character of the democratic bourgeois Republic. The murders of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg are events of world-historical meaning; not only because the best leaders of genuine proletarian International Communism were tragically done to death, but because it demonstrated the class character of the first European State—and one can also say the first State of the whole world without exaggeration, i.e., people taken under State control, can be murdered with impunity by officers and capitalists, under a Government of Socialists. It follows as a logical conclusion that the democratic Republic wherein this could happen is a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. People who showed their indignation of the murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, and who do not understand the truth of this are proving either their stupidity or their hypocrisy. In one of the freest and most civilized Republics of the world, in the German Republic, "freedom" is shown to be freedom to strike down the arrested leaders of the proletariat. And it can be nothing else so long as capitalism asserts itself, and the evolution of the democratic class struggle that to-day, as the result and consequences of the war, has reached the boiling point, is not weakening but increasing.

At the present time throughout the whole of the civilized world expulsions, hunting down, and imprisonment of Bolsheviks is taking place, as, for example, in one of the free "democratic" Republics, Switzerland; further, we have in America Bolshevik pogroms and so on. From the historical point of "democracy in general" or pure democracy, it is simply laughable that advanced civilized democracies, countries armed to the teeth, should be afraid of a few dozen people from backward, starving, ruined Russia, depleted as savage and criminal in millions of copies of capitalist newspapers. It is clear that the society in which such obvious contradictions can find a hearing is in reality a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

12.—In such a situation the dictatorship of the proletariat is not only fully justified as a means for the overthrow of the exploiter and the suppression of his resistance, but is also absolutely necessary for the whole mass of the workers, as the one protection against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, which led to the war and is preparing new wars.

The main thing which so many Socialists do not understand, and which causes their theoretical shortsightedness, their clinging to middle-class prejudices, and their political betrayal of the proletariat, is that, in capitalist society, with increasing grounds for the class war, there can be no half-way between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Every dream of any kind of third thing is only the reactionary lamentations of the petty bourgeois. This is shown in the experience of more than a hundred years of evolution of the bourgeois democracy and the workers' movement in every civilized country, and especially in the experience of the last five years. It is also furnished by the whole lesson of national economies, the whole tenor of Marxism, which has demonstrated the fatal economic necessity of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie for every capitalist business, a dictatorship that can only be overthrown by the class that is developed, augmented and reinforced by the very development of capitalism, i.e., by the proletariat.

13.—The second theoretical and political blunder of Socialists consists in that they do not understand that the forms of democracy commencing with the germ in ancient times have, during thousands of years, inevitably undergone radical transformation through the replacement of one governing class by another. In the Republic of ancient Greece, in the States of the Middle Ages, in the advanced capitalist States, democracy has different forms and different extensions. It would be the greatest folly to think that the most profound revolution in the history of mankind, the first transference of power out of the hands of the exploiting minority into the hands of the exploited majority, can fully develop within the confines of the old bourgeois Parliamentary democracy, or can be accomplished without a revolution; without the construction of new forms of democracy, new institutions, conditions, stipulations, and so on.

14.—The dictatorship of the proletariat is

so far like the dictatorship of other classes in that it, as in every other dictatorship, is faced with the necessity of suppressing with force the resistance of the class which is losing its political power. The fundamental difference of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of other classes, the dictatorship of the big landlords in the Middle Ages, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in every civilized capitalist country, is that the dictatorship of the big landlords and bourgeoisie was a suppression by force of the resistance of the overwhelming majority of the people, namely, the working classes. While on the other hand the dictatorship of the proletariat, is a suppression by force of the exploiter, i.e., the minority of the people, the big landlords and capitalists.

From this is very evident that the dictatorship of the proletariat must not only bring with it inevitable changes in the forms and institutions of democracy, but also changes that will permit an extension of democracy in the hands of the wage-slaves of capitalism, such as the world has never yet witnessed.

In reality the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat which as a matter of fact has already been worked out, i.e., the Soviets in Russia, the Council System (Ratssystem) in Germany, the Shop Stewards' Committees and other analogous Soviet institutions in other countries, all these render it possible for the working classes, i.e., for the overwhelming majority of the people, practically to utilize democratic rights and liberty to an extent that has never before been approached in the best democratic bourgeois Republics.

The essence of Soviet power lies in the direct organization of the class which capitalists would suppress, i.e., the worker and half proletarian (the peasant, who does not exploit the labor of others, and is at least compelled to sell part of his own). This is the fixed and only foundation for the whole power of the State, the whole State apparatus. The masses, which plainly, even in the "democratic" bourgeois Republics, were according to the law they stand on an equal footing, but by thousands of artful dodges of one sort and another are prevented from taking part in the political life and the exercise of democratic rights and freedom, are now called upon to participate constantly, directly, and in decisive manner in the democratic management of the State.

15.—The equality of the citizen (burger) without respect of sex, creed, race, nationality, which the bourgeois Republic always and above all promises but because of the powers of capitalism never carries out, the Soviet-power or dictatorship of the proletariat has at one stroke fully realized. The workers alone are able to attain this power, as they have no interest in the fight over the division of private property, means of production, and so forth.

16.—The old (that is the capitalist) democracy and Parliamentarism were so organized that the working classes were clearly the furthest removed from the management-machine. The Soviet-power (that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat) is on the contrary so organized that the working classes are closely identified with the management-machine by the uniting of legislative and executive power in the Soviet organization of the States, and in the substitution of territorial voting circles by industrial entities, such as those of the works and the factory.

17.—The army was an apparatus for suppression not only in monarchy; it remained the same in all (even in the most democratic) bourgeois Republics. Only the Soviet-power, as the one established State-organization of the capitalist-oppressed classes, is in the position to remove the dependency of the military into the proletariat by the arming of the proletarians and disarming of the bourgeoisie, without which it is not possible to carry through the conquest of Socialism.

18.—The Soviet organization is therefore so contrived that the proletariat as a class, which for the most part is uneducated concerning capitalism, plays the leading part in the inner State. The experience of every revolution and every movement of the enslaved classes, the experience of the world-wide Socialist movement, teaches us that only the proletariat is in the position to unite and lead forward the misdirected, backward, and exploited workers.

19.—Only the Soviet organization of the State is in the position to overthrow once and for all the old bourgeois officialdom and law-apparatus, which is preserved, and must inevitably be preserved, even in the most democratic Republics, and which was in fact the greatest obstacle to the workers and working masses in the carrying out of democracy. The Paris Commune took the first world-historical step in this direction. The Soviet power has taken the second.

20.—The destroying of State-power is the object held out by all Socialists, with Marx at their head. Without realizing this object true democracy—i.e., equality and freedom—cannot be reached. But it is only the Soviets or proletarian democracy which leads directly towards this object, for it draws the workers and their mass organizations towards a lasting and definite participation in the management of the State.

21.—The complete bankruptcy of the Socialists who met together at Berné, their complete lack of understanding of modern proletarian democracy, can be seen, especially in the following: On 10th February, 1919, at Berné, Branting declared the international conference of the Yellow International to be closed (geschlossen). On 11th February their members in Berlin, in the paper "Die Freiheit" published an appeal



In the name of the Independent Socialists to the proletariat. In this appeal the bourgeois character of the Scheideemann Government was pointed out and reproached with wishing to abolish the Councils, which were called the "supporters and defenders of the Revolution"; and the proposal was made of legalizing the Councils, giving them political rights, and giving them the right to veto the decisions of the National Assembly and the right to submit decisions to a popular referendum.

Such a proposal indicates the complete mental (spiritual) bankruptcy of the theorist who defends democracy and does not understand their bourgeois character. The laughable effort to unite the Council System, i.e., the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, shows the lack of consciousness of the Yellow Socialists and Social-Democrats, and the reactionary policy of the petty middle-class (Mittelburger), as well as their cowardly concessions to the increasing power of the new proletarian democracy which cannot be held back.

22.—The majority of the Yellow International at Berne, which condemned Bolshevism but

did not risk putting it into a formal resolution for fear of the working masses, has acted correctly from the class standpoint. The Majority is already in full agreement with the Russian Minority (Mensheviks) and Social-Revolutionists, and with the Scheideemanns in Germany. The Russian Minority and Social-Revolutionists who complain about the intervention by the Bolsheviks take pains to conceal the fact that this persecution has been brought about through the Minority and Social-Revolutionaries taking part in the civil war on the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. Just the same in Germany have the Scheideemanns and their party taken part in the civil war on the side of the capitalist against the worker.

It is therefore quite natural that the majority of those who took part in the Yellow International at Berne should have condemned the Bolsheviks; nevertheless this is not a defence of "pure democracy" but an expression of self-defence by people who feel that in the civil war they are standing on the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

From this the class-standpoint of the Major-

ity of the Yellow International at Berne can be fairly seen: the proletariat, however, should not be afraid of the truth, but should look it openly in the face and draw from it all political deductions.

On the basis of this thesis and in appreciation of the reports of the delegates from the various countries, the International Communist Conference declares that the main task of the Communist Party, in countries where the Council-Power (Ratmacht) is not yet set up, consists in the following:—

1) To explain to the great mass of the working class the historical meaning of the political and practical necessity for a new proletarian democracy which must be set up to take the place of the bourgeois democracy and Parliamentarism.

2) In the building up and extending the Councils in every department of industry in the military, in the fleet, also amongst the land workers and small farmers; and

3) In the conquest (eroberung) a solid and conscious communist majority within the Councils.

## The Split in The French Socialist Party.

AND ITS EFFECT UPON THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN EUROPE.

Toward the end of December, 1920, a congress of the French Socialist Party was held at which a split occurred. As we have no exact and full information about this congress we are compelled to depend upon the information given in the capitalist press.

Splits in the French socialist movement have been of frequent occurrence. At the end of the last century, in the 80's and 90's there was in France a large number of Socialist Parties and factions, representing the different currents in the socialist movement; the possibilists or opportunists; the Guesdists or Marxians, who adhered to the position of the German Social-Democrats; the Blanquists, who denied the necessity of the mass struggle; and the so-called Socialist-Radicals, who defended the interests of the petit-bourgeoisie.

In 1890 all these parties and factions were forced to unite into one party under the increased pressure of the reaction in France. In 1900 the French Socialist Party split again into its component parts as a result of the famous Dreyfus Case which aroused tremendous forces. Several prominent socialist leaders of that time—Jaures and Millerand—took a keen interest in the trial, considering it their duty to fight against the French militarists and in defense of the upper bourgeoisie, of which a numerous element, the large financial interests, were composed of Jews, who considered it their duty to defend their co-religionist, Dreyfus.

The Marxian section of the French Socialist Party, the Guesdists, organized in the Labor Party of France, fought against the opportunist policies of Jaures and Millerand. The participants in the struggle against the militarists were carried away by the fight and considered the activities of the militarists to be so dangerous that they believed it necessary for Millerand who was a "socialist" at that time, to enter the Waldeck-Rousseau ministry. The followers of Jaures and Millerand believed that the French Republic was in danger, and Millerand therefore took upon himself the task of saving the bourgeois republic in close co-operation with the infamous General Gallifet, who became notorious by his barbarous cruelties in suppressing the Paris Commune.

Millerand entered the Cabinet, June 22, 1899, thereby arousing a determined opposition in the ranks of the French Socialist Party. In 1900, there was convened, in Paris, the World Congress of the Second International.

The question of the acceptance of a post in a bourgeois ministry, by the "socialist" Millerand in the same Cabinet with the murderer, Gallifet, was brought before the congress and made an issue by the Guesde faction of the French Socialist Party. This question was brought up and discussed at the Paris Congress, in connection with another question—the tactic of the seizure of power by the proletariat which even at that time was a principle question, since the German revisionists under the leadership of Bernstein, advocated the peaceful evolution of Socialism by means of parliamentary action.

It would be inconsistent to expect any decisive action by the elements composing

Paris Congress of the Second International at that time. The question of the seizure of political power by the proletariat was closely connected with another of great significance—the question of the necessity of overthrowing the capitalist state by force of arms. The opportunists denied the correctness of Marx' famous statement, that force is the midwife of the old society, pregnant with the new order. In the course of the discussion, the renegade Kautsky, then the foremost Marxian theoretician, displayed his real colors. Although theoretically a Marxian, he was in reality an opportunist, even at that time, which can be readily seen from the following excerpt from a resolution introduced by him: "...In the present development of the democratic state the conquest of political power by the proletariat cannot be achieved by means of armed forces, but can only be the result of long and strenuous efforts in the sphere of political and economic organization of the proletariat, as well as its physical and moral regeneration, and of the gradual penetration of its elected representatives into the municipal councils and legislative assemblies."

This resolution introduced by Kautsky at the Paris Congress of 1900, played into the hands and supported the opportunists and anti-Marxians, who argued against the inevitability of armed revolution. This resolution of Kautsky was, in our opinion, his first step in the direction of the social patriots and renegades of our time. Plekhanoff, aptly characterized it as being an india rubber, or caoutchouc, resolution. The first part of Kautsky's resolution relegates into the background the question of armed insurrection, while the second part entirely justified the action of Millerand in accepting a ministerial post in the same cabinet with the murderer Gallifet. Kautsky's resolution adopted by the Paris Congress precipitated a split in the French Socialist Party: the Guesdists and Blanquists leaving the so-called "United" French Party.

After a while the different factions again united into one party organized upon a federative basis, but the various factions never ceased fighting among themselves up to the outbreak of the war in 1914. When the war began all the contending socialist factions united and formed a block with the bourgeois government and thus betrayed the cause of the proletariat. Guesde, who was one of the foremost exponents of revolutionary socialism in France, accepted the post of minister, without portfolio, in order to save the "fatherland" from destruction. The noisy Brasseur, Herve, who previously had fought against militarism, was the first to announce his anti-militarist position and became a traitor to the cause of the proletariat. In short the French Socialist party, under the leadership of Guesde, Renaudel and Semard, went over, bag and baggage, to the side of the bourgeoisie during the whole period of the imperialist world-war.

In the French party contained other elements, who constituted a minority: the "centrists" whom Comrade Lenin characterized as men contaminated with the decay of "galism" who were spoiled by the atmosphere of parliament, officials, softened by

the holding of sinecures and accustomed only to routine work. These "leaders" merely form a transition from the outlived epoch of the working class movement from the period of 1871-1914—an epoch that contributed much of value, especially in the art of organization of the exploited masses on a large scale, which was necessarily slow, sustained, and systematic work—an epoch which formed the background before the World War, which introduced the era of social revolution. The "centrist" are revolutionists in words, but in deeds support directly or indirectly the social traitors.

At the head of the centrists, stood Longuet, Pressman, Cachin, and Frossard, etc. At the end of the World War the centrists expelled the social-chauvinists from the executive offices of the party and had on their side the great majority of the membership up to the last congress of the Party. During the period of the world war the French working class, intoxicated with bourgeois patriotism, followed in the footsteps of the social traitors. Later disappointed with the consequences of the war they repudiated the chauvinists and went over to the side of the centrists.

The economic and political conditions in France forced the French proletariat to turn to the left. They could not remain halfway between the right and left wings of the French socialists. Their act in joining the centre was only a transitional stage in the revolutionary movement of the French proletariat. Already during the war, there appeared within the French Socialist Party a small group of Communists under the leadership of Comrade Lorient. For a long time Lorient fought almost alone against the right and centre and was the subject of ridicule by the opportunist leaders. Lorient, undismayed, bravely kept up the fight in the face of the greatest obstacles, against the social traitors to the French proletariat.

The growth and influence of this small group of Communists, with Lorient at their head, was aided by the centrist Longuetists, themselves. After the manner of all centrists, the Longuetists endeavored to convince the French workers that the economic chaos caused by the war, was not the proper environment in which to advocate the armed seizure of political power by the workers. The Longuetists, were attempting to delay the realization of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Meanwhile the economic chaos continued despite all attempts of the capitalists and the state to restore the ruined industries. The French bourgeoisie were disappointed in their hopes of wringing a huge indemnity from Germany, which was utterly ruined by the war. All these circumstances aroused a serious discontent within the ranks of the French working class driving it further and further to the left.

Still another event influenced the French working class movement—the visit of Cachin and Frossard to Soviet Russia. These two comrades are among the most prominent leaders of the French socialists. Frossard was secretary of the party. The Communist group within the French Socialist Party grew more influential and stronger day by



day and gradually forced the centrist administration out of power.

A strong influence upon the growth of the communist group was exercised also by the syndicalist movement within the French trade union movement. The syndicalist movement is a reaction against the opportunists and parliamentarists who attempt to convert parliamentary action into a means for the achievement of our final aim—the establishment of the Communist Society. The experience of history proves the impossibility of the reconstruction of a society upon communist principles by means of parliamentarism. But the syndicalist in contrast to the opportunists went to the other extreme—the negation of political action altogether. They refused to recognize the necessity of using the parliament for revolutionary purposes; they refuse to recognize the necessity of establishing the workers' state—the dictatorship of the proletariat. Opposition to the opportunists and all opportunist tendencies is highly desirable, but the opposition to political action as a whole, i.e. the denial of the necessity for the seizure by force of arms of the political power and of the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is an anarchist superstition and prejudice inimical to the interests of the working class movement.

The French syndicalists are becoming more and more convinced of the fallacy of their anti-political views and are joining the ranks of the communists in large numbers.

At the last congress of the French Socialist Party held in Tours the Communists, supported by the former syndicalist elements, won a brilliant victory over the old majority who were led by the centrists, as well as over the right wing. This congress adopted all the conditions for admission to the Communist International by an overwhelming majority; the vote being, for unqualified acceptance—3500; for acceptance with reservation—1000; against recognition, 500. Thus the Communist Party of France has finally come into being through the splitting of the old French Socialist Party.

What influence will the formation of the Communist Party of France exert upon the development of the international communist movement?

The French bourgeois Republic up to the time of the imperialist world war was the ally of the reactionary and bloody government of the Czar in Russia. In the past the French bourgeois was ruthless and brutal in its struggle against the working class. In France every big strike or demonstration was usually attended by much bloodshed. The French bourgeois government is one of the most reactionary in the world. In 1831, in June 1848, and in May 1871, the French bourgeoisie drowned in blood the revolutionary uprisings of the proletariat.

During the monarchist regime in Russia the government of the Czars was the terror of all nations. Nicholas the first sent an army across the boundaries of Hungary, in

1848, to crush the revolutionary movement in that country; the Czarist government of Russia was the world policeman whom all feared.

Soviet Russia, the government of the workers and peasants, came to the aid of the world proletariat, after first overthrowing the Czarist and bourgeois regimes and establishing the proletarian dictatorship. The proletariat of all countries welcomed the defeat and overthrow of the world's policeman—the autocratic government of the Czars; but its place was taken by the present French Bourgeois Republic, which now occupies the position of the world gendarme.

The French government is imperialist and seeks to crush the revolutionary movement in all countries—especially in Russia. The Soviet Government is a thorn in the side of the French Bourgeoisie, which has violently opposed all the Russian proletarian movement from the first day of its existence. Of all the Entente, the French imperialists are the most bitter and brutal adversaries of the Soviets and of every revolutionary proletarian movement in all countries. They participated in the plundering adventures and counter-revolutionary movements in European Russia and Siberia, and instigated all the Baltic and "buffer" states to violence against Soviet Russia. They were instrumental in causing the downfall of the Hungarian Soviet Government by compelling the Roumanian Government to declare war upon it.

During the proletarian uprising in the Ruhr Basin, the French imperialists sent their troops into that province, ostensibly to prevent Germans from invading France, but in reality for the suppression of the German proletarian Revolution. The last adventure of the Polish landlords and capitalists against Soviet Russia was carried out with the direct support of the French imperialists, who incited the Poles to undertake this unprovoked attack.

This despicable role of world gendarme, the French were able to perform because of the guarantees and support of the social-patriots in the French Socialist Party. Even the "centrists" under the leadership of Longuet did not prevent the criminal plots of the French imperialists, because while they recognized Soviet Russia in words, they obstructed the formation of a real Communist Party in France. The Communist Party in France will give rise to a new epoch in the French proletarian movement. The French imperialists will be forced to recognize the power of the communists; they will not have such a free hand as before, when they faced the Socialist Party alone.

The French proletariat is seasoned in the revolutionary struggle. In 1786, one hundred and four years ago, Babeoff promulgated the theory of the common ownership of all wealth, and emphasized the class war, denounced the "Republic of the Rich", and advocated the abolition of all political rights for those who do no useful work. In 1831, the strike of the silk weavers of Lyons was the first insurgent movement of the

wage slaves of France. The first experience of the social revolution on a political basis took place in 1848. The first threat to the whole bourgeois dictatorship appeared in 1871, in Paris. The first conquest of political power by the proletariat, and the proclamation of the proletarian dictatorship, occurred in the same year in Paris.

All this proves that the French proletariat has a revolutionary tradition which will be of the greatest value during the present period of social revolution. The formation of the Communist Party in France will benefit the whole European proletariat. The communists will place every obstacle in the way of the ruling class; they will throw all their strength against a possible invasion by French imperialists of Soviet Russia.

The German proletariat had a dangerous neighbor—the Russian Czarist Government, with its vast army, and therefore the German proletariat did not dare to challenge their oppressors. After the establishing of the Soviet power in Russia the German workers are no longer threatened from the East. The recent experience of the German workers has shown that the French Imperialists will always come to the aid of their German Imperialist friends in order to save the German capitalist system, notwithstanding their recent unpleasantness; because the French imperialists thoroughly understand that the destruction of German capitalism would be followed by the downfall of the bourgeois order in France.

The German proletariat will act and fight more courageously against their ruling class, with the realization that on the western border the Communist Party of France will prevent the French capitalists from crushing the movement in Germany.

The Communist Party of France, as it acquires power, will perform the same role as the Communist Party of Russia, i.e. it will rid the European proletariat of the threat of the world's policeman in the shape of the French capitalist government. The Communist Party of France will prepare the French proletariat to become the shock battalions of the revolution in Western Europe for which their revolutionary traditions has already equipped them.

In Germany the left Independents and the German communists have already united into one German Communist Party. The Communist Party of Germany and the Communist Party of France, under the leadership of the Communist International, will form the force which will overthrow the capitalist governments of Western Europe, and will erect upon their ruins the proletarian dictatorship, during the transitional period from the capitalist to the communist society.

The Communist Party of France will eventually put an end to all the desperate adventures of the French imperialists and will give a powerful impetus to the communist movement of the workers throughout the world.

## The Split of the German Independent Party.

By KARL RADEK.

The cause of Communism has made a great stride in Germany. The majority of the conference of the Independent Social Democratic party accepted the conditions of admission into the Communist International; the minority left the conference declaring its intention of constituting itself a separate Independent Party. We may openly state that this split is an event of paramount importance assuring the development of Communism in Germany. There can be no doubt of the fact that the actual majority within the Independent Party is larger than that which adopted the platform of Communism at the conference. The whole party machinery and the party press had been with few exceptions, in the hands of the Right wing, which consists of the most adept bureaucrats of German Social Democracy. It is because of this that the Right Independents were able to muster over a third of the number of delegates present at the conference. The spirit of revolution lives in the working masses of the Independent Party. Were it not for the conditions set up by the Communist International making the admission of the Right Independents into its ranks impossible, these Right Independents would have joined it in order to avoid being isolated from the masses of their members and in order to be able

again and again to hold these masses back from revolutionary action. The transference of the party leadership and of the party press to the genuinely revolutionary elements has compelled the Right Independents to throw off their masks. Thus, Dittmann has begun a campaign against Soviet Russia and has written articles which were so much to the taste of international counter-revolution that the latter has had them reprinted in the capitalist press all over the world. Hilferding and Crispian have raised the cry that affiliation with the Third International would mean war with French imperialism, and they have come out openly in the defence of the Versailles Peace. They have thus proved to every working man the correctness of the policy of the Communist International in refusing to have such gentlemen as Hilferding, Dittmann and Crispian in its ranks. The Crispian and the Hilferding have tried to stage a comedy of defending the independence of the German working class against the dictatorship of Moscow. They have endeavored to turn to account against the Communist International the last remnant of nationalism still in the brains of the German workers for the idea of defending the independence of his organization. But all their efforts have been futile. In spite of the fact that the Left Inde-

pendents lacked such a powerful means of agitation as the press, the great majority of the workers declared themselves for the Communist International. They readily grasped the fact that when the Communist International "interferes" in their affairs it is not the interference of an outside force trying to impose its will upon the German workers, but that it is a case of a more experienced detachment of the Army of the World Revolution pointing out to the German workers the conditions of their own victory. They have understood that they and Moscow are one and the same; that the contest against Moscow is the contest against their own revolutionary aspirations, their own revolutionary views. Our victory at the Independent Party Conference is of the utmost importance, considering the fact that it was bought at the price of a split, in the course of which the German workers will have acquired a clear and comprehensive idea of the programme and tactics of the Communist International. The struggle, of course, has not ended with the split at the conference; the split will be carried into all the organizations of the Independent Social Democratic Party; it will lead to division among the German workers on the lines of clear-cut principles, enabling the German workers to outlive



all their reformist and "centrist" illusions and to take a firm stand on the platform of Communism, for which they have more or less consciously been fighting for the last two years. The German Independent Party comprises about one million votes. If the Left Independents, who are soon to amalgamate with the Communists, number a hundred thousand members, constitute at least a half of the Independent Social Democratic Party, and we are sure that they will actually be in the majority—we shall soon have in Germany a powerful Communist Party.

The split of the Independents and the passing over of the majority into the camp of Communism is the logical outcome of the whole trend of history in Germany from the very first days of the revolution; it is the result of the ideological struggle which German Communism has been carrying on for approximately ten years not only against reformism but also against Kautskianism, against the irresolute, against those who are doing lip service to the revolution whilst supporting reformism by actual deed. The struggle which the Left Radicals—the heralds of the Communist Party in Germany—had conducted in the ranks of the old Social Democracy against the policy of compromise with the liberal bourgeoisie, against the Kautskian parliamentary and pacifist illusions, as opposed to the former's advocacy of revolutionary mass action, had even then found an echo in the ranks of the proletariat. However susceptible the proletariat may in fact have been to this revolutionary propaganda, it did not as yet see the vital importance of the Revolutionary Struggle. The choice between Revolutionary Mass Struggle and the Imperialist War was accepted by them as a purely theoretical alternative. The German proletariat did not believe in the possibility of the impending conflict, and if it did, it dropped its arms, in indecision shrinking before the vast and terrible power of State wielded by Junkers and the bourgeoisie and stood listening to the talk of Kautsky about the waiting policy that would secure them victory. The German proletariat has paid for its revolutionary impotence in millions of victims on all the imperialist battlefields. Taught by the experience of the Imperialist War, it withdrew its advanced guard from the camp of reformism and split the powerful German Social Democracy, thereupon rallying around the banner of the revolution. It was, however, still unable to see the thing through to the end, and in spite of the fact that it welcomed Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Johann and others, it nevertheless believed that the Dittmanns, the Hilferdings, the Haases and the Ledebours, who were doing lip service to the revolution, would prove the defenders of the latter. The Spartacus group and the Bremen Left Radicals, who were combating the lies of the Independent Centrists, were still in the minority amongst the German revolutionary workers had only to stretch out their arm for time a heavy price for its irresolution.

At the fall of German Imperialism, when the German bourgeoisie was disarmed, the workers had only to stretch out their arm for the power of State to be theirs. The Haases, the Dittmanns and the Hilferdings abused the confidence of the revolutionary workers and helped the traitors, Scheidemann, Ebert, and Legien to cheat the workers, by handing over the government to the bourgeoisie; and the latter, having created its white army, suppressed all the rising of the German workers and fettered them hand and foot. In December 1918 the vanguard of the German workers, in face of this open treason of the Independent Party, grouping around its banner the most intelligent and energetic part of the German working class. But soon after its inauguration, it lost its best leaders during the first rising of the Berlin workers. Driven underground and robbed of its legal press, it nevertheless succeeded, by sustained relentless criticism, to unmask the attempts of compromisers to hold the workers back from revolutionary action; it managed to inspire the honest and resolute Independents of the Left to a more determined struggle against the Hilferdings and the Dittmanns. Struggling in the front ranks of the workers, even when the latter erred in their estimation of the situation, it served as a model of revolutionary determination. Combating the romanticism and the aberration of the Left Communists, for whom the proclaiming of revolutionary watchwords served as a substitute for revolutionary propaganda within the mass organizations of the workers, it pointed out the road to the German proletariat in its hard struggle for power. Being an illegal organization it could not rally round itself the vast masses of the workers whom Noske, by his counter-revolutionary object lesson, had taught that there was no escaping the Dictatorship of the proletariat. These masses flocked to the legal Independent Party, which at least provided them with a mock struggle against the bourgeoisie and the social traitors. Gradually with growing determination, they forced their revolutionary ideas upon the Independent Party. They extorted from their Right leaders the recognition of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and of Soviet Right leaders, with whom such recognition was mere lip-service, were incapable of carrying it into effect. Then the Communist Party of Germany sought a rapprochement with the left Independents, who though theoretically humane, nevertheless endeavored to carry on the revolutionary struggle and helped to familiarize them with the neces-

sity of a break with the Right leaders, helped them to find the path to the Third International. The heroic struggle of the Russian proletariat added point to the criticism of the German Revolution and to the criticism of the German Communists. It kindled the faith in the revolution in the hearts of the millions of German Independent workers. The Congress of the Communist International only summed up in work of decades of revolutionary thought in Germany; it demonstrated to the German Independent workers that the removal of the dead-weight blocking the way to revolution, the break with the Right leaders, would mean union with the Right leaders, would mean union with the International Revolutionary Proletariat. In the International barriers erected by the bureaucratic machinery of the German Independent Soc. Dem. Party, the conference at Halle gave expression to the feelings that are wide-awake in the hearts of the millions of revolutionary German workers. It reflected their readiness to take the field for the realization of the revolution; it was a signal to the whole world that Germany was marching towards momentous revolutionary battles.

The Communist Party of Russia has steadfastly believed in the revolutionary German workers even when the German revolutionaries spoke in tones of despair of the former's inertia. On that historical night at Brest-Litovsk, when newly-born, defenceless Soviet Russia, stood face to face with German Imperialism, armed to the teeth, it put its card on the revolutionary proletariat of Germany. And this

card has not failed it. November 1918 knocked Brest-Litovsk over. At the moment when the majority of even the revolutionary German workers, cherishing democratic and pacifist illusions, surrendered the cause of their emancipation into the hands of the compromisers, into those of Wilson, the Russian Communist Party did not lose faith in the German workers. It stretched its hand out to them across the lines of the German white guards; it spoke lines of the German fog of lies manufactured to them across the lines of the German white guards; and over the heads of the criminally silent Independents, in all the conflicts of the German proletariat, the independent worker have fought and shed their blood side by side with our brothers, the German Communists. The Communist Party of Russia, and the Communist International guided by it in mercilessly criticising the mark from dependent Party, and tearing the mask from its face, have sought a way to the hearts and minds of the German independent workingmen and have found it. The majority of the German Independent workingmen are with us; they have openly gathered around the standard of Communism; and we hail them, as comrades in arms, with the profound conviction that the struggle which they are waging will lead to the liberation of the German workers from the yoke of Capitalism, from the noose of the Versailles Peace; it will unite revolutionary Germany with revolutionary Russia and will hasten the emancipation of the International Proletariat.

## Theses on the National and Colonial Questions.

Adopted at the Second Congress of the Communist International.

### A. THESES.

1. It is typical of bourgeois democracy by its very nature, to take an abstract of formal attitude towards the question of the colonies in general, and to that of national equality in particular. Under the appearance of the equality of human beings in general, bourgeois democracy proclaims the formal or juridical equality of the proprietor and the proletarian, of the exploiter and the exploited, thereby the greatly deceiving the oppressed classes. On the pretext of absolute equality of human beings, which is in itself but a reflection of the relations caused by commodity production, into an instrument in the struggle against the abolition of classes. But the real essence of the demand for equality is based on the demand for the abolition of classes.

2. In conformity with its chief task—the struggle against bourgeois democracy and the denunciation of its lies and deceptions, the Communist Party, being the class-conscious expression of the struggle of the proletariat to cast off the yoke of the bourgeoisie, must not advance any abstract and formal principles on the national question, but must first analyse the historical, and before all, the economic conditions second, it must clearly distinguish the interests of the oppressed classes, of the toilers, of the exploited, from the general conception of national interests which in reality means the interests of the ruling class; third, it must equally separate the oppressed and subject nations from the dominating nations, in contradistinction to the bourgeois democratic lies concealing the enslavement of a vast majority of the population of the earth by an insignificant minority of the advanced capitalist nations, which is peculiar to the epoch of financial capital and imperialism.

3. The Imperialist war of 1914 has demonstrated very clearly to all nations and to all oppressed classes of the world the deceitfulness of bourgeois democratic phraseology. That war has been carried on on both sides under the false motto of the freedom of nations and national self-determination. But the Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest peace on the one hand, and the Versailles and Saint German peace on the other, have shown how the bourgeoisie establishes even "national" boundaries in conformity with its own economic interests. "National" boundaries are for the bourgeoisie nothing but market commodities. The so-called "League of Nations" is nothing but an insurance policy in which the victors mutually guarantee each other their prey. The striving for the reconstruction of national unity and of the "reunion of alienated territories" on the part of the bourgeoisie, is nothing but an attempt of the vanquished to gather forces for new wars. The reuniting of the nationalities artificially torn as under corresponds also to the interests of the proletariat, but real national freedom and unity can be achieved by the proletariat only through the revolutionary struggle and by the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. The League of Nations and the policy of the Imperialist powers after the war demonstrate this even more clearly and definitely, making the revolutionary struggle in the advanced countries more acute, increasing the ferment of the working masses of the colonies and the subject countries, and dispelling the middle class nationalistic illusion of the possibility of peaceful collaboration and equality of nations under capitalism.

4. It follows from the fundamental principles laid down above, that the policy of the Communist International on the National and Colonial questions must be chiefly to bring about a union of the proletariat and working masses of all nations and countries for a joint revolutionary struggle leading to the overthrow

of capitalism, without which national inequality and oppression cannot be abolished.

5. The political situation of the world at present time has placed the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the foreground, and all the events of world politics are inevitably concentrating around one point, namely, the struggle of the bourgeois world against the Russian Soviet Republic, while it is grouping around itself the Soviet movements of the vanguard of the workers of all countries, and all national liberation movements of the colonial and subject countries, which have been taught by bitter experience that there can be no salvation for them outside of a union with the revolutionary proletariat, and the triumph of the Soviet power over imperialism.

(to be continued in the next issue).

## Financial Report.

### C. P. CASH STATEMENT FOR DECEMBER, 1920.

Cash Received, 1920.		
Dues: From Fed. (Nov.)		1521.00
From Dist. (Dec.)		140.60
		1661.60
Initiation Fees		111.00
Day's Pay		1744.37
Organization Fund		616.03
Chic. Defense Lists		1821.81
Defense Fund		468.25
Communist Returns		639.74
Paper No. 2		83.49
Leaflets		109.99
Literature		476.27
Convention Exp. Returned		85.00
Convention Assess.		176.50
Loans Payable		100.00
Distr. Adjust. Red. Bal.		79.72
Total Received in December		7823.77
Balance from November		5901.12
	Debit Total	13424.89
Cash Paid.		
Sec. & Techn. Dept.:		
Salaries	550.00	
Postage and Supplies	18.13	
Printing Circulars	86.00	
Rents	62.50	
Miscellaneous	28.25	744.87
Editorial Dept.:		
Salaries	450.00	
Literature	20.20	470.20
C. P. C. Meeting Expense		139.39
National Organizers Expense		85.07
District Expenses:		
Salaries		1655.00
Trav. Expense		449.48
Misc.		200.67
Communist		324.37
Paper No. 2		711.81
Leaflets		1237.38
Literature		2478.80
Convention Expense.		48.18
Add'l Contingency Fund Ccctn. Dept.		65.00
F. & F. Trunk for Edit. Dept.		7.60
Defense Fund to Chic. Committee		239.63
Loan to Jewish Fed.		500.00
Loans Paid		30.00
Distr. Incr. Bal.		807.77
Total Paid in December		10214.99
Balance to January		3209.90
Credit Total		13424.89

Fraternally submitted  
C. Dobin, Exec. Sec.  
C. P. of A.